In the above-identified Office Action certain objections were raised under 35 U.S.C. §112 with respect to the language of Claim 27. By this response, however, Applicants have amended Claim 27 along the lines suggested in the Office Action, so that it is believed that the claim now conforms to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Also, the claims were again rejected as being obvious in view of a combination of the disclosures of the GUT and XIAO references. In view of the foregoing amendments to the independent claims, however, Applicants believe that the claims are allowable for the reasons set forth below.

In particular, the requirements of now-cancelled Claim 25 are incorporated in Claim 1, so that Claim 1, as well as independent Claims 12 and 27, requires checking if a downloading of a second data item is complete, and when the downloading is incomplete, if more than one address is obtained during a seeking step and stored in the storage means of a peer device trying to access (or to download) the second data item by using other addresses obtained and stored in the storage means of the peer device. This invention is supported in the Specification at page 17, lines 24 to 31.

In the present patent application, since an address of that data item is already stored, some time and bandwidth are saved at the moment of effective access by the used to second data item.

Referring now to the prior art, GUT discloses storing various components used to construct an object in a distributed cache system. A regenerative cache system determines its

own cache memory through a file table, directory or address map (column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 5). The location of the components are tracked and stored. In GUT, *"the object can be identified by an external request or from the regenerative cache system determining that the object be obtained and cahced in anticipation of a future request"*. Thus, GUT discloses seeking for an object before any user request for that object.

In addition, in GUT, once a requested object is constructed, the cache system stores the constructed object and, in some embodiments, the components used to construct the object. In other embodiments, once the requested object is constructed, the components are not stored (see column 6, lines 55 to 67, cited by the Examiner in connection with Claim 25).

In the XIAO reference, a group of client machines is connected by a local area network. When a web service is requested in a client machine, a browser cache in the client machine is searched in order to attempt to satisfy the request. If the request misses in the browser cache, the client machine sends the request to a proxy server. The proxy cache is searched for the same purpose. If the request misses in the proxy cache, the other client machines of the group are searched.

What is not disclosed in the prior art, however, is Applicants' claimed requirement for checking if a downloading of a second data item is complete, and when the downloading is incomplete, <u>if more than one address is obtained during a seeking step and stored in the storage means of a peer device</u> trying to access (or to download) the second data item by using other addresses obtained and stored in the storage means of the peer device.

For these reasons, it is believed that the claims as now presented are allowable over the cited prior art, wherefore the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

 /John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 5906197v1